

BEYOND WASTE BREAKOUT GROUP

Focus on:

MRW 8: Ensure MRW and hazardous substances are regulated and managed according to hazards, toxicity, and risk.

MRW 12: Develop and implement a strategy for a more regionally focused MRW program by evaluating the most significant threats and effective approaches, including safer alternatives, to reducing those threats.

Questions pondered:

1. How would you evaluate significant risk?
2. Based on experience, what part of the MRW waste stream poses the greatest hazard, toxicity, risk?
3. Which are more difficult wastes to manage?
4. What is the range of options for reducing MRW?
5. What criteria would you use to pick appropriate strategies?

Discussion points:

- DOH has lots of data on accidental poisonings/accidental injury
 - One examination of data showed lots of incidents where pharmaceuticals led to car accidents
 - Another source of data to consider: accidental poisoning database, WA Poison Center
- Diazinon is the new DDT but has decreased in the environment since it was banned. 2,4-D becoming a major problem
- Landfill leachate analyses reviewed are not comprehensive enough to make links to MRW in landfills as a source
- Ask urban waters/local source control specialists what they are finding in storm drains
- Regarding MRW 12, “regional” has many meanings and not one in particular for this recommendation
- Don’t base MRW characterization on feedback of this small MRW group. Need comprehensive study in Washington
- No known studies that have characterized product use
- King County inspected 50,000 businesses and putting info into database. Quality control very difficult
- Are we (Ecology) going to differentiate work on HHW vs. CESQG?
- Ecology is linked with local source control specialist so can get information from them
- Florida has as very rigorous inspection program for businesses – may want to call them to see if they have information on sectors and biggest problems
- Give each CESQG a tracking # and have them report, just like MQGs, LQGs
- San Francisco has lots SQG information (similar to what may be found for Puget Sound?)
- Can’t afford to collect 100% MRW, need to focus on products(may collect 5% of HHW now)
- Look at British Columbia data on product purchases. Check with Product Care (Mike O’Donnell has contact info)

- Home surveys – see what's out there, what people are using, storing
- Can't only look at amount of MRW collected (5% or 2%), need to look at decrease in # accidents, trailer fires, chemical reactions at facilities that may be a result of MRW diversion
- Similarities between OR & WA, E-waste comparison showed almost the same ton/per capita & percentage of waste type (TV's vs. monitors) & models
- Are we (Ecology) trying to educate public to take to HHW facility? No, trying to eliminate risk of products, not increase collection
- Chemical bans? That, and chemical policy, product stewardship and the range of ideas to reduce toxicity of products
- Before promoting a new "green" product, have an end of life management plan. This was a failure for CFLs
- Artists – solvents in artistry and in most product categories listed as MRW. Dave Waddell provides a 'good' and 'bad' list to artists for simplicity. The artist then posts it to blog and reaches many. Artist will not know regulation or get inspected – educate through non-traditional means
- How do we tell people that something is 'safer' when we don't know? Need to develop criteria to evaluate 'safer'. Example – California shamed companies with hexane in products and manufacturers stopped adding hexane to their products (heptane instead, which is apparently much safer)
- If able to get rid of MRW as a special waste stream to manage, which is a very expensive program, think of where that \$ could go instead
- Educating millions isn't where effort should be. Need to focus on TSCA reform – bigger use models we know work (REACH)
- 13 states writing "Principles of TSCA Reform", including WA
- Local governments want to be more involved in WA's efforts. Carol Kraege will see how to do this.